

A MOVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' INTERACTION

Oleh :
Dwi Winarsih
Dosen FKIP Universitas Tidar Magelang

ABSTRACT

Penelitian dilakukan untuk menjelaskan *functional moves* yang dipakai untuk menandai berlanjutnya interaksi. Analisis data didasarkan pada konsep fungsi ujaran yang dikemukakan oleh Eggin and Slades (1997). Interaksi dalam hal ini percakapan dilaksanakan dengan *opening, continuing, and sustaining* yang terdiri dari *responding and rejoinder*. Interaksi terdiri dari inisiasi dosen, respon mahasiswa, dan umpan balik. Ketika tidak ada respon dari mahasiswa setelah inisiasi dosen, kemudian dosen memberi inisiasi lagi (*re-inisiasi*) untuk memulai percakapan. Maka kegiatannya inisiasi, *re-inisiasi*, respon, dan umpan balik. Kemajuan interaksi ditandai dengan *Rj:C:Challenge:Detach move*. Hal tersebut direalisasi dengan kata *well* atau *okay*. Analisis tersebut menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa dapat bercakap-cakap dengan bahasa Inggris meskipun mereka mendapatkan kesulitan yang disebabkan oleh kurangnya kompetensi komunikasi khususnya *actional competence*. Akibatnya mereka kehilangan kesempatan untuk berbicara pada tahap diskusi dan gagal merespon. Kurangnya *actional competence* juga menjadi hambatan untuk mengemukakan pendapat dan argumen.

Key Words: functional move, opening, continuing, sustaining

A. BACKGROUND

The students of English as a foreign language normally expect lessons in the speaking classroom to give them both language practice and information about language usage. The uniqueness of a foreign language classroom is the fact that it often combines students and lecturers from a variety of language and cultural backgrounds. It makes the attention to meaning making by its participants particularly important.

Along with the unique nature of the speaking foreign language classroom it comes to dilemma for teaching and learning process. The students try to get an atmosphere and environment that will allow them to get the speaking skill. Most students are conscious of the needs to listen and produce English and to be instructed to have correct pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary that they are unable to identify and express by themselves. The teaching and learning process, however, may be relatively inefficient for the methodical mastery of English language system, as the lecturer has limited time to provide opportunities for a real world communication in the target language.

Speaking lecturers wrestle with the dual demands of their students – demands for opportunities to negotiate meaning authentically through interaction with their classmates and for explicit instruction and controlled practices. They undoubtedly wish to make the environment efficient for students as well. These multiple goals in the classroom are apparent in the discourse patterns of the lesson that are jointly constructed but generally teacher controlled. The medium of instruction is also the content of the lesson lecturers need to accommodate the goals of providing opportunities for language use and explicit

instruction and controlled practice. Students and lecturers may not share a common language for communicating ideas and students vary in their abilities to understand and produce English.

The study of the lecturer and the students interaction in speaking class is aimed to explain the functional moves used to signal the progressions interaction

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Generally move is regarded as a functional-semantic reinterpretation of the turn constructional unit. Eggin and Slades (1997) argue that a move is a unit after which a speaker change could occur without turn transfer being seen as an interruption. It is realized by a clause.

One of the criteria to determine whether in a particular instance a clause is a move is the grammatical dependence or independence of the clause. The grammatical dependence or independence of the clause as defined by Martin and quoted by Eggin and Slades (1997), move as a clause which select independently for mood is a useful point of departure. The clauses which do not select independently for mood generally do not function as separate move. The three combinations of clause, i.e. dependent, embedded clause, and quoting or reporting clause frequently constitute a single move.

Concerning with move it is classified into four, namely opening, sustaining, responding, and rejoinder move.

1. Opening move

Opening move is such a start of an interaction. An interactant's proposition at the initial of interaction is realized

to initiate talk. The opening move is mostly assertive. They are independent move at prior move.

These opening moves are classified into two, they are moves that function to express attendance and the ones that function to initiate a conversation. The attending move functions to express attendance and it is actually an attention seeking that is realized in formulaic and minor clauses.

2. Sustaining Move

Sustaining moves follow the mood structure set up in an initiation. The interactants keep negotiating the same proposition. Sustaining talk is achieved by those who have just talked using continues speech function or by other interactant who takes turn to react. Sustaining move can be divided into two types; these are continuing move and reacting move.

3. Continuing Move

In continuing move, the interactants may realize the move by using three options; monitoring move, prolonging move, and appending move

1) Monitoring Move

In monitoring move, the interactants make use of the move on the state of interactive situation. It is to check whether the audience is following and inviting another interactant to take the turn. The congruent mood used in this move is elliptical major clause or minor clause with interrogative intonation.

2) Prolonging Move

Prolonging move functions to add the continuing speaker's contribution by explaining further information. It is possible for the interactants to get more than one move because they realize this prolonging move using clauses in which the relation of the clauses to negotiate is what Matthiesen (1995) called logico semantic relation especially expansion type. The interactants build the prolonging continuation by logically connecting the first move and its prolonging sequels. The considering ways of prolonging move are elaborating, extending, and enhancing.

a) Elaborating

Elaborating provides further information of the one in the prior move. This mood uses full declarative mood. The interactant may restate, clarify, refine, add a descriptive attribute, or exemplify.

b) Extension

The basic meaning of the extending relation is that of addition or variation. The interactants take turns to add the information or argue contrasting information to the previous move. The congruent mood used is full declarative.

c) Enhancement

Enhancement is such a move in which the interactants try to qualify the information in the immediately previous move by telling temporal, spatial, causal, or conditional detail. This move uses full declarative mood.

3) Appending Move

The appending move is supposed to be the final type of continuing move. It occurs in mid way between a continuing : prolonging speech function and a reacting : developing move. When an interactant makes one move, loses the turn, then as soon as he regains the turn he produces a move which represents a logical expansion of the immediately prior move is labeled as appending move. The logico relation of the current and the prior move in appending move which is considered as expansion.

a) The elaborating appending move occurs if the interactant wants to clarify, exemplify, or restate the previous move after another interactant takes turn. The congruent mood elaborates nominal groups.

b) The extending appending move occurs if the interactant offers additional or contrasting information to the previous move after another interactant interrupts him. The congruent mood extends nominal group.

c) The enhancing appending move occurs when the interactant qualifies the prior move after an interruption of another interactant. The congruent mood enhances prepositional or adverbial phrase.

b. Reacting Move

The function of sustaining move is to keep negotiating the proposition. It is achieved by another speaker taking turns or reacting speech function. If it occurs it means the interactants experience reacting move.

1) Responding Move

In responding move, the interactants negotiate a proposition or proposal of the previous interactant. In this case the respondent accepts to be placed as a respondent and accept to negotiate the other's proposition. The two possible responses are supporting that are preferred or confronting that are dispreferred or discretionary ones.

a) Support Responding Move

Eggin and Slades (1997;201) state that there are four main categories of support responding move, i.e. developing, engaging, registering, and replying. Those sub-classes are support responding move of the previous move in term of different degree and type of negotiation, that the interactant enters the move.

(1). Developing Support Responding Move

Developing support responding move shows support responding move that is a very high acceptance of the previous interactant's proposition. The move is expanded as it is in the continuing move such as elaboration, extension, and enhancement.

An elaborate developing responding move symbolized R:S:Develop:Elaborate in the analysis expands on the previous interactant's proposition. They may restate, clarify, or exemplify prior proposition and the move is realized by one interactant when two clauses are related by elaborating conjunctions for example I mean, like, for example, etc.

An extend developing responding move symbolized R:S:Develop:Extend is a move which expands on a prior interactant's move by adding further supporting contrasting information in detail.

An enhance developing responding move symbolized R:S:Develop:Enhance is a move in which the interactant enhances the previous interactant's move by expressing a temporal, causal, or conditional qualification. It is realized by an interactant when two clauses are related by enhancing conjunction.

(2) Engaging Support Responding Move

Engaging support responding move is symbolized R:S:Engage. It is an exchange compliant reactions to attending move and it also shows willingness to interact by responding to solutation. The interactant negotiates an agreement going ahead. This move is identified by the use of minor clauses, often duplicating the lexical item and/or intonation of the opening solutation.

(3) Registering Support Responding Move

Registering support responding move symbolized R:S:Register is such a reaction to display attention to the speaker and support encouragement for other interactants to take another turn. To negotiate, they do not introduce a new thing because they expect next speaker take turn.

(4) Replying Support Responding Move

Replies are the most negotiatory of responding reaction, although they negotiate the proposition given by prior speaker. Eggin and Slades (1997) say that it may be realized by accepting, complying, agreeing, answering, acknowledging, or affirming.

An accept support responding move is symbolized Rs:S:Accept. In this move, the interactants accept an offered good or services and realize an expression of thanks or use non-verbal response.

A comply support responding move is symbolized R:S:Comply. This move carries out demand for goods or services. An agree support responding move, symbolized R:S:Reply:Agree support information conveyed by the prior speaker. The interactants realize it by using yes: positive polarity mood.

An answer support responding move symbolized R:S:Reply:Answer is a move in which the interactant answers the previous interactant's question in order to provide information he need. The congruent mood used by the interactants is complete missing structural elements.

An acknowledge support responding move is symbolized R:S:Reply:Acknowledge. In this move the interactant responses to a factual statement and indicate knowledge of information given. The congruent mood used is expressions of knowing.

An affirm support responding move is symbolized R:S:Reply:Affirm. It is such a move in which the interactant tells the positive response to a question. This is realized using yes : positive polarity.

b). A confront Responding Move

A confront responding move is the second sub-classification of responding move. It breaks the move into two, they are disengage and reply. Disengage is a kind of move when there is no response to the prior move. While the confronting responding reply moves range from either non-comply, disagree, withhold, disavow, or contradict.

A non-comply confront responding move symbolized R:C:Reply:Non-comply implies inability of the interactant to comply a command in the previous move. This might be

expressed using non-verbal language, no expression of undertaking, or negation of verbal command.

A disagree confront responding move is symbolized R:C:Reply:Disagree. In this move, it is a negative response of the prior question. The congruent mood is negation of proposition.

A withhold confront responding move symbolized R:C:Reply:Withhold is realized by interactant to show his inability to give information needed by the previous interactant. It uses negative elliptical declarative mood.

A disavow confront responding move is symbolized R:C:Reply:Disavow. In this move, the speaker denies the acknowledgement of information stated by the previous interactant. The congruent mood is an expression of disclaiming knowledge.

A contradict confront responding move is symbolized R:C:Reply:Contradict. It negates the statement that is conveyed by the previous interactant.

2) Reacting Rejoinder Move

Rejoinder is completing the negotiation of a proposition or a proposal (Eggin and Slades, 1997, 207). It is a sequence of interaction that interrupts, postpones, aborts or suspends the prior speech function. Generally, there are two sub-classes in this move, namely tracking and challenging moves. These moves deal with supporting and confronting alternatives in the responding move classes. It means these two moves are to prolong the conversation in which tracking move is supporting negotiation, while challenging move confronts the prior move.

a) Tracking Rejoinder Move

Tracking rejoinder move functions to check, to confirm, to clarify, and to probe. Eggin and Slades (1997,207) argue that these moves support in the sense that they merely delay anticipated exchange completion without indicating disagreement.

A checking track support rejoinder move is written Rj:S:track:check in the analysis. The interactants make use of this move to check the information they miss or misheard on the previous move. A confirming track support rejoinder move is symbolized Rj:s:track:confirm. This move seeks verification of what the speaker indicates they have heard (Eggin and Slades;1997;209). The congruent mood used to realize this move is elliptical wh-interrogative and wh-element from prior move.

A clarifying track support rejoinder move is symbolized Rj:s:track:clarify. It seeks additional information in order to understand a prior move (Eggin and Slades;1997;210). The congruent mood used to realize this move is elliptical interrogative and wh/new element that is not in the prior move.

A probing track support rejoinder move, symbolized Rj:s:track:probe, offers further detail or proposes implications for confirmation to the initial speaker (Eggin and Slades;1997;210). The interactants realize this move by having full clause with new subject, however it is built in logico-semantic relation with the prior move. It is tracking or tagged declarative mood.

b) Challenging Rejoinder Move

Challenging rejoinder move confronts the previous proposal by attacking. This move directly confronts the

positioning implied in the interactant's move. Thus they actively reject negotiation of what has been said by the previous interactant. Eggins and Slades (1997:214) differentiate three main types of challenging rejoinder move. They are detaching, rebounding, and countering.

A detaching challenge confront rejoinder move, symbolized *Rj:c:challenge:detach*, seeks to terminate the interaction to avoid any further discussion. It is realized in silence or expression of termination, such as okay, well, alright, etc.

A rebound challenge confront rejoinder move, symbolized *Rj:c:challenge:rebound*, is such a move which (Eggins and Slades;1997;212) sends the interaction back to the first speaker by questioning the relevance, legitimacy, or veracity of another speaker's move. To realize it the interactants use wh-interrogative, elliptical mood.

A countering challenge confront rejoinder move is symbolized *Rj:c:challenge:counter*. This move expresses confrontation by offering an alternative, counter position, or counter interpretation of a situation raised by a previous speaker (Eggins and Slades;1997;212). This move is realized by non-elliptical declarative mood or negation of understanding or rightness.

Refute challenge confront rejoinder move is symbolized *Rj:c:Challenge:Refute*. This move functions to contradict import of challenge. Rechallenge challenge confront rejoinder move is symbolized *Rj:c:Challenge:Rechallenge*. This move functions to offer alternative position. The interactants realize this move by using elliptical interrogative mood.

METHOD

This study is intended to describe what functional moves are used to signal the stage progression and how moves progression are realized through meaning negotiation between the lecturer and students. While an approach of the study used, is functional-semantic approach to language.

The subjects of the study are students of the English Department, who took a 2-credit speaking lecture. In this research, I just tape-recorded the conversation of the students and the lecturer during pre-activity period.

B. FINDING

To determine the move, first, there are two choices; open or sustain. Since the lecturer's turn occurs at the beginning of the exchange, it belongs to opening. I have two choices to state the type of opening, i.e. attending or initiating.

Based on the four analyzed conversations of the lecturer and the students above, focusing on the number of turn taking, I find that those conversations are dominated by the lecturer.

After examining further, I have got the fact that the students gained less turn compared to the lecturer. This indicates that the students are likely to keep silent. They fail to take the opportunity to speak in an oral communication, except the lecturer appoints one of them. She usually asks question to encourage them to take chance to speak. The example below presents the fact that the students lost chance to speak.

In clause (ii) the lecturer actually expected a response but none of the students responded to her question. Here, the lecturer seemed to know the students' problem. She re-stated her questioning clause (iii), (iv), and (v), she hoped by repeating

the topic the students could have taken a turn. However, there was no response anymore, after that she asked a question to continue her move by using track:check one. When the students responded to that move in chorus, this proved that even provided with an inviting move such continue:monitor move, they tended to fail to use the chance offered.

Concerning those two findings above, I analyzed why the students had problems or lose the turn in responding a given move offered by the lecturer. It might be influenced by the students' sociocultural competence, that involves all interactants role and an understanding of social context. Besides, interpersonal negotiation involves looking at what kinds of role relation and how they negotiate to take turn. Since the conversations I analyzed were between a lecturer and students in classrooms, I could explain that the students think they have unequal power. They do not have the same right to talk for the sake of politeness. They just wait when the lecturer appoints them to talk. The problem in this case deals with freedom to talk which is affected by unequal power. The findings above extremely affected the improvement of the students' actional competence, because they did not feel free to use linguistic forms to achieve the function of language.

In conversation afternoon class Speaking III-1, student 2 took turn and she said (i) I sometime send a letter*. The word "sometime", here, was not appropriate. Then, the lecturer realized response:repair move (i) She sometimes send a letter. She pronounces the word "sometimes" louder than the other words in order to show that that word has different meaning from "sometime" and the lecturer's word is the correct one. It functioned to criticize the use of inappropriate lexical term used

by the student. In this case, she actually wanted to explain that sometime meant some day, whereas sometimes referred to the frequency.

Another interesting fact to analyze occurs in the conversation morning class Speaking III-1, turn 8. The student says "(ii) I explain them (iii) there is windows on the house (iv) and the cage of the cattle is separated from the owner's house". After the lecturer listened to these clauses, she made response: repair move and wrote the right clauses on the blackboard. She intended to recheck the clauses without discouraging the student. She also asked all students to read them together. It was her technique to explain how to build correct clause.

Based on those two findings above, I am able to explain that the students have problems in responding to a given move offered by the lecturer. The students might acquire correct word order, syntax, and lexical items but not understand how to achieve a desired and intended function through careful selection of words, structure, intonation, and non-verbal signals of a particular stretch of discourse. This is caused by their lack of communicative competence especially actional competence. It is the aspect of communicative competence concerned with knowledge of understanding communicative intent and conveying message.

After examining the conversations particularly the moves produced by the lecturer and the students, I find that in all conversations the lecturer is the one who always initiates to open the conversations. In this case the lecturer produced opening moves which function to show that the conversation is about to begin. The opening move that is likely to produce is

open:initiate:attend move that consists of four ,
open:question:fact move that consists of four,
open:statement:fact move that consists of six, and
open:initiate:command move that consists of five.

The open:initiate:attend move is always made by the lecturer when she just arrives at the classroom. This opening necessarily constitutes a greeting. In conversation morning class Speaking III-1, the lecturer's clause (i) Good morning serves both purposes recognition and greeting. It functions as an identification that the lecturer has just arrived and as a start of conversation. Since it happens in the classroom, the sort of greeting used by the lecturer is the formal one.

None of the greeting is started by the students. The problem is likely to be caused by power and atmosphere. The lecturer and the students do not have equal power and the atmosphere is quite formal. In formal atmosphere, someone who has less power, in this case, students usually let someone who has more power, the lecturer take turn to speak first.

In line with teaching-learning process, a general idea of what the goal of the classroom is to offer instruction and to obtain learning. The interaction in Speaking class, is designed by the lecturer to obtain verbal contribution from the students.

The open:question:fact move is also produced by the lecturer as opening. She encourages the students to take turn to speak. This move functions to introduce the students what they are going to talk, for example in conversation morning class Speaking III-1, the lecturer realized her move in interrogative mood by saying "(i) How was your voluntary work in the village ?". Here, the lecturer tried to inform the students that she was going to talk about voluntary work. Talking about

fact, the lecturer hoped it was easy to discuss, because they experienced it. It encouraged the students to speak. It implies that asking facts do not cause any risks. The students state plain because all are based on their factual experience.

The next move is opening:statement:fact. The lecturer made use of this move to inform the fact of what they were discussing on that day. In other words, it functioned to pass on facts, opinion, ideas, and new information to the students. So, it was not necessary for the students to give verbal response.

The last opening move organized by the lecturer is open:initiate:command move. She directed the students to take turn to say anything. She made this move after she offers a chance to speak but none of them made use of it. This implies that the students are somewhat reluctant to take any risk. They believe that taking turn might cause problem. They unfortunately forget that being fluent and correct in speaking needs practice. When they make mistakes, the lecturer always gives feedback implicitly. The lecturer is never angry to or annoyed them. She even appreciates the students' contribution in the conversation.

Analyzing the continuing move, I find that the lecturer made 36 moves and the students just made 16 moves. These comprise six continue:monitor move produced by the lecturer, twenty two continue:prolong:elaborate move produced by the lecturer and students produced six moves, fourteen continue:prolong:extend move produced by the lecturer and students produced six moves, five continue:prolong:enhance moves produced by the lecturer and students produced one, and three continue:append:elaborate moves produced by the lecturer.

The sixteen moves of continue:monitor were made by the lecturer only. She employed this move to check whether

the students were following or not. As in conversation morning class Speaking III-2 turn 3 of the lecturer, she realized this move by saying (ii) okay ? in raising intonation. This minor clause might be rephrased into "are you following me ?". It implies that the lecturer tends to check whether the students still follow the message she transfers. Celce-Murcia et. al. (1995) call this move interpersonal communication strategy. It plays very important rôle in the flow of a conversation. It can also improve the value of the move, so the conversation runs so smoothly. Examining continue:monitor move, I did not find any produced by the students. This indicates that the students never use their interpersonal communication strategy when they talk to someone who has more power.

The next continuing move is prolonging one that consists of elaborating, extending, and enhancing. In the four analyzed conversations, I find twenty eight moves of continue:prolong:elaborate. This total number is the greatest compared to other moves produced by the lecturer and the students. While the next two prolonging moves are continue:prolong:extend made by the lecturer and students twenty moves and continue:prolong:enhance made by the lecturer and students six moves.

The lecturer directed the students to discuss about relation in her first clause. Then she continued her move to give further explanation by employing continue:Prolong:elaborate move in her second clause.. To make it clear, she spoke slowly and repeated the word "relation". In my opinion it will be clearer if she uses clause linkers such as "I mean" or "for example" to show logico semantic relation. Then she adds information explicitly in the third clause using conjunction "or" for the prior

move as another option to discuss. However, some of them are likely not to produce long move. I might conclude that the students' actional competence is fairly good.

The other continuing move is appending, in the oral discourse I analyze, I just find one kind of it. The lecturer made three moves of continue:append:elaborate. It means the lecturer and the students hardly interrupted when one of the interactants took turn.

Student4 ended her R:S:Reply:Answer move by using falling intonation. The lecturer thought that he would end his move, so she continued the discussion realizing S:C:Prolong:Extend move. This actually was not correct because when the students used fall intonation or paused his utterance, he was thinking the reason for his idea. The appending move is part of the student's move at his previous turn taking.

Analyzing overall continuing move. I relate those findings. They show that the students are not likely to check whether the lecturer understands their talks which are organized in more than one move. They never realize sustain:continue:monitor move. This tendency brings about bad effect for the students, because they have become accustomed not to produce the monitoring move for checking the interlocutor's attention towards their message. However, it also has advantage neglecting the interlocutor's attention. They may produce prolonging:elaborating, extending, and enhancing freely in many clauses. Thus, they seem to be fluent to speak English.

Based on Eggin and Slades' concept (1997), the reacting move is divided into two, i.e. responding and rejoinder. In this sub-section I would like to organize the interpretation of the finding into two, the respond reacting and rejoinder reacting.

Concerning the classification of the reacting:responding move, Eggin and Slades (1997) sub-classify them into two, the supporting and the confronting moves.

In the four analyzed conversations, I find that supporting moves are mostly used by the lecturer and the students. While confronting moves are produced one in conversation morning class and one in the afternoon class. The following is the illustration of the exact number. S:C:Develop:Elaborate consists of fourteen , S:C:Develop:Extend consists of ten, S:C:Develop:Enhance consists of two , R:S:Engage consists of eight, R:S:Register consists twenty, R:S:Reply agree consists of nine, R:S:Reply:Answer consists of seventeen, R:S:Reply:Acknowledge consists of twelve, R:S:Reply:Affirm consists of four, R:C:Reply:Disagree consists of two, R:C:Reply:Withhold consists of one, and R:C:Reply:Contradict consists of one.

The facts above imply that both lecturer and students tend to accept the interlocutors' proposition. They avoid to contradict even when when it is quite possible to. Most students agreed with the lecturer's proposition. In this case the students did not produce move in order not to take risk.

The greatest number of responding move are support:register produced by the lecturer and the students. The lecturer made support:register move more than the students did. Respond:support:reply:answer is another kind of reacting move, which matches with the prior move produced by the lecturer. The moves above were the most negotiatory of responding reactions. The student tended to give short answer in her reply:answer move. She realized elliptical dependent clause, where the subject "I" and the finite verb "Swim" comes from

the lecturer's clause at the prior move. The students thought that by expressing short answer saved them. They did not have to talk much. They were worried to say using inappropriate clause more often than the right one.

Looking closely at supporting move, again I find that the lecturer always encourages the students to talk by supporting them to express their idea.

After the student answered the lecturer's question that tried to clarify the prior move in order to get additional information, the lecturer responded her student to a statement of fact by saying "O..oh". It indicates the lecturer acknowledges the information given by the student.

In supporting response, the students were also likely to provide positive response to the lecturer's questions. Here the student supported the lecturer's move using positive response to avoid problems. It implies that the student is somewhat reluctant to take any risks.

The second kind of reacting move is rejoinder. There are two main sub-classes of it, i.e. supporting and challenging move. Examining those two major moves of rejoinder, I find fifty five moves which comprise forty four moves produced by the lecturer and nine moves produced by the students.

The lecturer made much more rejoinder: support moves because the students tended to respond using short answer. Then, she tracked the prior move by producing checking, confirming, clarifying, or probing move.

The student responded the prior move by producing reply: answer move. He did not tell the reason of his idea. It seemed he did not want to take a long turn to speak, so the lecturer took turn to seek verification what she had just heard.

In the four analyzed conversations such cases often happened, that's why the lecturer made tracking move more than the students did.

Tracking move in the conversation I analyzed sometimes functioned to remind the students that their clauses were not appropriate.

Concerning the Rejoinder:Reacting move, I find something else, i.e. the confront:challenge:detach move. It was mostly produced among challenging move. The lecturer and the students tended to make such move to stop the interaction. They usually realized this move by using minor clause.

Surprisingly the student responded to the lecturer's move by laughing only. He did not continue his move, although it was quite possible for him to answer whether he would go or not on another day. He preferred responding to the lecturer with this form of challenge:detach move to terminate the conversation.

Another function of rejoinder:confront move is to show attention to an interlocutor. Rj:C:Respond:Rechallenge move especially seemed to show the fact that the lecturer was actively querying the veracity of what had been said by the student, even though her move was realized in a clause that was greatly influenced by Indonesian. In this case, both interactants, the lecturer and the student, repeated the word nation because it was the main topic.

C. CONCLUSION

The lecturer is the one who always ends the communication channel during pre-activity interaction in Speaking classes. I find there was a set of signals that allowed

the interactants to run the conversation smoothly. They used Rj:C:Challenge:Detach move to signal stage progression. Since the pre-activity interaction in Speaking classes was a lecturer-centered program, she always produced the move by using minor clause such as well or okay. In short, those signals used by the lecturer when she was ready to close the communication channel. In closing the whole pre-speaking activity, the lecturer then used the continue:prolong move. She usually restated what the tasks of the students were as it was stated at the initiation of discussion stage.

In line with power, the lecturer who had more power tended to pay more attention to the students when they took turns. Based on the finding the lecturer produced more tracking move than the students did. It means the students rarely pay attention whether the interlocutors listen to them or not. Thus they made few number of the continuing;monitor move.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Douglas,H. 1987. Principles in Language Learning and teaching. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc
- Celce, Murcia-Murcia et. Al. 1995. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specification. Paper. Regents of the University of California.
- Egin, Suzanne. 1994. An Introduction to Systemic Functional linguistics. London: Printer Publisher
- Hatch, Evelyn. 1994. Discourse and Language Education. USA: Cambridge University Press

Hymes, Dell. 1989. *Foundation in Sociolinguistics*.
Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania